Application No. 09/911,673   Customer No. 01933
Response to Office Action

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 6 has been amended to be rewritten in independent form. Clearly, no new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claim 6 be approved and entered.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1-13, 16, 17 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by USP 6,314,479 ("Frederick et al"); claims 14, 15 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Frederick et al and USP 5,630,043 ("Uhlin"); claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Frederick et al and USP 5,991,085 ("Rallison et al"); and claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Frederick et al, Uhlin and USP 6,473,058 ("Hotomi et al"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as set forth hereinabove.

According to the present invention as recited in each of amended independent claim 6, independent claim 7 and independent

-8-

method claim 26, <u>on-screen display</u> information is stored in the
display apparatus of a display system. And according to the
claimed present invention, the on-screen display information is
transmitted from the display to the host apparatus, where it is
superimposed on a video signal and transmitted back to the
display apparatus from the host apparatus to be displayed.

With this structure, since the on-screen display information
is provided in the display apparatus and transmitted to the host
apparatus, it is possible for the host to superimpose the
appropriate on-screen display information on the video signal
transmitted to the display apparatus, even if a wide variety of
display apparatuses are attachable to the host apparatus.

According to the present invention as recited in independent
claim 6, moreover, power consumption data is also stored in the
display apparatus and transmitted to the host apparatus, which
comprises a power control section for entirely performing power
control of said display system based on said power consumption
data received from said host-side communication section.

As recognized by the Examiner, Frederick et al discloses a
"plug-and-display" display 12 which stores EDID information
including information on power consumption modes, such as ON,
STANDYBY, SUSPEND and ACTIVE-OFF. And as recognized by the
Examiner, according to Frederick et al the PC 14 reads the

-9-

supported power states from the display 12 to perform control of the display 12.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Frederick et al does not disclose, teach or suggest storing on-screen display information in the display apparatus and transmitting the on-screen display apparatus to the host apparatus to be superimposed on the video signal to the display apparatus.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Frederick et al discloses these features of the claimed present invention at column 15, lines 10-13 thereof. And the Examiner, referring to the final paragraph of column 10 of Frederick et al, points out with respect to claims 6, 7 and 26 that according to Frederick et al the PC 14 reads the EDID file stored in the display 12 and that the PC 14 requests the status of the monitor.

Therefore, the Examiner draws the conclusion that according to Frederick et al, "the power state, the OSD, the EDID and the status are defined [and?] said host side communication section receives said on-screen display information."

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that Frederick et al makes no connection between the on screen display (OSD) and the reading of the EDID file from the display 12 or the status request of the display 12 by the PC 14.

-10-

In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that according
to Frederick et al, the EDID file is read from the display 12 to
allow the PC 14 to determine the capabilities of the display 12.
And it is respectfully pointed out that according to Frederick et
al, the status requests by the PC 14 are performed while
requesting the supported controls from the display 12. That is,
the PC 14 requests the status of the display 12 via various
communication interfaces (USB, IEEE 1394, etc.), and when a valid
response is received via one of the interfaces, the PC 14
requests the supported controls from the display 12.

It is respectfully submitted that neither reading the EDID
file nor requesting the status of the display 12 via various
interfaces entails receiving on-screen display information from
the display 12 according to Frederick et al.

In fact, it is respectfully pointed out that the portion of
Frederick et al cited by the Examiner with respect to an on
screen display (column 15, lines 10-13) merely explains that if a
problem occurs with signals supplied to the display 12, an on
screen display (OSD) is preferably used to communicate the
problem to the user.

It is respectfully submitted that the technique of
displaying an error message on a display mentioned at column 15,
lines 10-13 of Frederick et al does not at all relate to the
features of the claimed present invention whereby on-screen

-11-

Application No. 09/911,673   Customer No. 01933
Response to Office Action

display information is stored in the display apparatus,

transmitted to the host apparatus, and superimposed on the video

signal to the display apparatus to be transmitted back to the

display apparatus and displayed.

And it is respectfully submitted that. even though an EDID

file and means for answering a status request are provided on the

display 12 according to Frederick et al, it does not at all

follow that on screen display information is also provided at the

display 12, and transmitted back to the PC 14 to be transmitted

back to the display 12 superimposed on a video signal, in the

manner of the present invention as recited in independent

claims 6, 7 and 26.

It is respectfully submitted, moreover, that the remaining

cited references are no more pertinent to independent claims 6, 7

and 26 than Frederick et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that

the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 6,

independent claims 7 and 26, and claims 9, 11 and 13-21 depending

from claim 7, clearly patentably distinguishes over Frederick et

al, taken singly or in combination with any of the other cited

references, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

* *

-12-

Application No. 09/911,673   Customer No. 01933
Response to Office Action

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv
encs.

-13-